CISNEROS are, and at all times mentioned in this Complaint were, residents of the County of

Alameda, State of California. 26

27

8

9

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

	Case 3:
	-
1	2.
2	Code of C
3	corporate,
4	to plaintif
5	Complain
5	is informe
7	DOE is ne
3	thereby, ca
,	
)	3.

Defendants DOES 1 through and including 50 are sued in this Complaint under Eivil Procedure Section 474. The true names or capacities, whether individual, governmental, partnership, associate or otherwise, of these defendants are unknown f who, therefore, sues these defendants by fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this t to show their true names and capacities when they have been ascertained. Plaintiff ed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the defendants designated as a egligently responsible for the events and happenings referred to in this Complaint, and nused injuries and damages to the plaintiffs.

Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS and OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO are, and at all times mentioned in this Complaint were, police officers employed by the CITY OF BERKELEY and were residents of the State of California.

15

Each and every reference in this Complaint to "defendants" shall be deemed to 4. refer to each and all defendants unless a specific defendant is named or the context otherwise requires.

Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that at all times 5. referred to in this Complaint each defendant was the agent and/or employee of each other defendant and was acting in the course and scope of that agency and/or employment.

23

24

Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that at all times 6 relevant to this Complaint the City of Berkeley operated, controlled and maintained a police 26 force, commonly known as the Berkeley Police Department.

20

Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that members of the Berkeley Police Department, including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS and OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO, were aware of the fact that Rocky resided at the 23358 Jorgensen Lane, Hayward, California, premises prior to their arrival.

26

12. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and on that basis allege, that no exigent circumstances existed for the attempted execution of the search warrant by defendants, including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS and OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO, and other officers and agents of the Berkeley Police Department. Despite that, defendants, including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS AND OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO, and other officers and agents of the Berkeley Police Department came on to the property in an attempt to execute the search warrant without knowing the exact whereabouts of the dog, Rocky, and without having developed a realistic plan for controlling the dog.

11

12

10

When defendants, including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, 13. DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS 14 AND OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO, and other employees and agents of the Berkeley Police Department came on to plaintiffs' property on April 20, 2005, their conduct constituted unreasonable conduct in the execution of a search warrant, subjecting plaintiffs to an unreasonable search and seizure in that, among other actions, 1) defendants, including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER 19 K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS AND OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO, and other employees and 20 agents of the Berkeley Police Department, discharged a fire arm in close proximity to plaintiffs KASI CISNEROS and BEATRICE CISNEROS without provocation, 2) defendants, including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS AND OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO, and other employees and agents of the Berkeley Police Department shot and killed plaintiff's dog, Rocky, without provocation, 3) defendants, including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS AND OFFICER F. R.

27

26

21

22

1 ONCIANO, and other employees and agents of the Berkeley Police Department forced

2 plaintiffs to the ground and verbally and physically threatened plaintiffs and 4) defendants,

including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN, DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA,

OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS AND OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO, and other

employees and agents of the Berkeley Police Department, entered the property and conducted

6 the search and seizure without probable cause.

7

The conduct of defendants, including defendants SERGEANT T. CURTIN,

DETECTIVE G. PON, OFFICER J. LUNA, OFFICER K. DEBLASI, OFFICER J. LOUIS

10 AND OFFICER F. R. ONCIANO, and other employees and agents of the Berkeley Police

11 Department was undertaken and completed under color of law and was a substantial factor in

12 causing harm to each plaintiff. Defendants' conduct caused each plaintiff to suffer the serious

and permanent injuries set out elsewhere in this complaint.

14

15

15. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff KASI

CISNEROS suffered personal injuries, including shock, mental anguish, mental and physical

pain and suffering, and other injuries, all to her general damage in an amount in excess of the

jurisdictional requirements of this Court.

19

20

16. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff BEATRICE

CISNEROS suffered personal injuries, including shock, mental anguish, mental and physical

pain and suffering, and other injuries, all to her general damage in an amount in excess of the

urisdictional requirements of this Court.

24

25

26

27

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

1	21.	Plaintiff FRANK CISNEROS incorporates Paragraphs 1 through and including
2	20 of this Co	mplaint into this Second Cause of Action.
3		
4	22.	Plaintiffs FRANK CISNEROS is, and at all times relevant to this Complaint
5	has been, the	spouse of plaintiff KASI CISNEROS.
6	•	
7	23.	As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of the defendants in bringing
8	about the inju	ries suffered by plaintiff KASI CISNEROS. plaintiff FRANK CISNEROS has
9	II .	ference with his marital relationship with plaintiff KASI CISNEROS, all to his
10	11	amount in excess of the jurisdictional requirements of this Court.
11		
12		THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
13		
14	AS A	ND FOR A THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR CONTEMPORANEOUS
15	EXPERIEN	CE OF INJURY TO A CLOSE FAMILY MEMBER AGAINST ALL
16	DEFENDAN	TS, PLAINTIFF KASI CISNEROS ALLEGES:
17		
18	24.	Plaintiff KASI CISNEROS incorporates paragraphs 1 through and including 23
19	of this Compl	aint into this Third Cause of Action.
20		
21	25.	Plaintiff KASI CISNEROS was present at plaintiff's residence along with
22	plaintiff BEA	TRICE CISNEROS and other close family members at the time of the incident
23	giving rise to	this complaint. Plaintiffs KASI CISNEROS is the daughter in-law of plaintiff
24	BEATRICE (CISNEROS.
25	//	
26	//	
27		
28		7 Complaint for Damages
		<u>-</u>

Plaintiff KASI CISNEROS observed the injuries to plaintiff BEATRICE 1 26. CISNEROS and other close family members as they were inflicted in the incident giving rise to this action. 5 27. As a result of the contemporaneous experience of the injuries to her mother inlaw and other close family members, plaintiff KASI CISNEROS has suffered physical and mental pain and suffering, shock, and other injuries, all to her damage in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional requirements of this Court. 9 10 FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION 11 AS AND FOR A FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR CONTEMPORANEOUS 12 EXPERIENCE OF INJURY TO A CLOSE FAMILY MEMBER AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS, PLAINTIFF BEATRICE CISNEROS ALLEGES: 15 16 Plaintiff BEATRICE CISNEROS incorporates paragraphs 1 through and 28. including 27 of this Complaint into this Fourth Cause of Action. 17 18 19 29. Plaintiff BEATRICE CISNEROS was present at plaintiff's residence along with plaintiff KASI CISNEROS and other close family members at the time of the incident giving rise to this complaint. Plaintiff BEATRICE CISNEROS is the mother in-law of plaintiff KASI CISNEROS. 22 23 24 30. Plaintiff BEATRICE CISNEROS observed the injuries to plaintiff KASI CISNEROS and other close family members as they were inflicted in the incident giving rise to 25 26 this action. 27

1	31. As a result of the contemporaneous experience of the injuries to her daughter-
2	in-law and other close family members, plaintiff BEATRICE CISNEROS has suffered physical
3	and mental pain and suffering, shock, and other injuries, all to her damage in an amount in
4	excess of the jurisdictional requirements of this Court.
5	-
6	WHEREFORE, plaintiffs pray for judgment against the defendants, and each of them, as
7	follows:
8	1. General damages according to proof;
9	2. Special damages according to proof;
10	3. Interest at the legal rate;
11	4. Reasonable attorneys fees as allowed by law;
12	5. Costs of suit; and
13	6. Such other and further relief as this Court
14	deems just and proper.
15	1 12
16	DATED: 4130 LAW OFFICES OF JOHN E. HILL A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
17	
18	By: /(1949)
19	JOHN E. HILL Attorneys for Plaintiffs
20	·
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	9 Complaint for Damages